EXHIBIT 5

EXHIBIT G

Message
_____

From: ██ ██ [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
             (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=██████6A8]
Sent: 4/14/2022 1:13:52 AM
To: ██
             ██
             ████████████
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":null,"threadFbId":4883750158359940}]

██ ██ (4/13/2022 09:47:54 PDT):
>Good morning all!
>
>1) ██ send an email with questions about our review follow-up this morning, and I emailed back. Both
emails have a few items this group should discuss & align on. Please read the email and give input on
whether we can do that async in this thread or if we need to schedule a VC.
>
>2) Rachany (our legal support) pointed me to a "Youth State of the Union" (also called "X-Meta Youth
Maturity Scorecard") effort being led by Miki and ████████. ██ shard that score card this morning
(it's locked down tight, but anyone who needs to see it could ask ██). This scorecard seems
comprehensive of Youth regulator risks, and now that we know it exists I don't think we need the "number
of planned regulator-initiated projects this half currently on track" metric. So I propose dropping that
idea unless anyone here objects?

██ █ ██ (4/13/2022 12:12:19 PDT):
>Hey ██, on #2, this is the scorecard that I mentioned that I'm involved with as well with Miki. The
main issue is that we want to make sure we're not duplicating work and not giving different narratives
across the 2 scorecards

██ ██ (4/13/2022 12:25:55 PDT):
>Fully aligned on not duplicating work. Do you agree that the Youth Maturity Scorecard renders the
proposed "number of planned regulator-initiated projects this half currently on track" metric redundant?
If so I suggest dropping the latter.

████████ (4/13/2022 13:22:00 PDT):
>#1: A meeting is probably fruitful for substantive discussion and fast progress?
>
>#2: Does the Youth scorecard have this specific metric in it? I may have missed it. If so dropping it
makes sense. If not, how do you plan to report on regulator sentiment in our hypothetical updates we send
to leads in the future? Is it just a reference to the scorecard?

██ ██ (4/13/2022 13:31:23 PDT):
>On 1 - sounds good. I'll find some time.
>
>On 2 - No, it doesn't have this specific metric. On regulator sentiment, I think there are two paths:
>a) Trust that Miki,██ are already reporting regulator sentiment and progress to ██ via SOTU, and
thus we can omit it from our report
>b) Develop a process whereby we link the SOTU in the leadership updates, ideally with a one-line summary
of changes since the previous update.

██ ██ (4/13/2022 13:33:06 PDT):
>#fileameeting

██ ██ (4/13/2022 13:37:07 PDT):
>Booked for monday at 3pm.

██ █ ██ (4/13/2022 14:05:11 PDT):
>on 2, the goal of the SOTU scorecard is to give a high level view at the company level and for each
individual app if we are (a) meeting regulatory requirements, (b) meeting external expectations, or (c)
industry leading. This would be across all the major problem areas (e.g. age appropriate experiences,
mental well-being, etc..). It will be more qualitative than quantitative and based more on availability
of features rather than metrics/measurement.

██ █ ██ (4/13/2022 14:05:54 PDT):
>i think our scorecard is intended to be much more metric driven. But at the narrative level in theory
they should be aligned.

██ ██ (4/13/2022 15:35:22 PDT):
> ██, do you think this takeaway recap will be ready before Monday's meeting? If so let's add that to
the agenda too.

████████ (4/13/2022 16:21:25 PDT):

>Yes and yes

█████ █████ (4/13/2022 18:04:22 PDT):
>What's the meeting on Monday about?

████ ████ (4/13/2022 18:13:52 PDT):
>I have the agenda on the invite. In brief:
>(1) discuss the items in █████ email about our leads review this morning, and my reply.
>(2) align on whether to drop "regulator sentiment" in the scorecard (deferring that signal to Youth SOTU).
>(3) discuss the learnings from █████ discussion with ██ ███ on "Teen As Content" (he'll send out notes before the meeting).

META3047MDL-047-00766940